



Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting**November 7, 2014****9:30 AM – 3:30 PM****Regional San Offices****Sunset Maple Room****10060 Goethe Road, Sacramento, CA 95827****Remote Access via WebEx****Call In Number: 1-877-951-5169 Access Code 949 281 0****WebEx**<https://waterboards.webex.com/waterboards/j.php?MTID=m24409dcc8252de3174512f13b4307b7b>**Draft Agenda**

1.	Introductions Establish quorum		9:30 Brock Bernstein Thomas Jabusch
2.	Announcements from Committee Members		9:35 Brock Bernstein
3.	Approve agenda and summary (Attachment) Agree on agenda and approve July 14 and September 7 meeting summaries	 14July2014 Draft SC Meeting Summary [14]  29Sep2014 Draft SC Meeting Summary [14]	9:45 Brock Bernstein Thomas Jabusch
4.	Discussion: Program Funding The goal of this discussion will be to review and prioritize funding proposals. Program staff will provide additional information on the costs of various administration and operation tasks, including data management. <u>Desired outcome:</u> - Initial recommendation for cost allocations		9:50 Brock Bernstein

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agree on procedure and information needs for a decision on how to allocate cost in Year 1 by December 		
5.	Lunch break		12:00
6.	<p>Decision: Year 1 monitoring plan As guided by the TAC and SC, SFEI-ASC is planning to complete the full Year 1 monitoring plan by January 2015. The monitoring plan will include the final designs and overall program costs (including data management and program management). Completion of the monitoring plan is pending a decision by the SC on the design proposals to be moved forward (e.g. any of all of the proposals for current use pesticides, mercury, nutrients, and pathogens). To inform the decision, TAC co-chairs will present the recommended monitoring design, estimated costs, and the timeline for implementing its various elements. <u>Desired outcome:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decision on elements to include in the Year 1 monitoring plan - Provisional funding levels for each element - Timeline and planning horizon 	< Monitoring design summary/TAC meeting summary>	<p>1:00 Brock Bernstein Stephen McCord</p>
7.	<p>Decision: Roles and responsibilities Per discussion, staff has further revised the roles and responsibilities document to add additional program background, further clarify the role of the implementing entity, and add additional program background <u>Desired outcome:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discuss and approve revisions 	<Roles and responsibilities doc >	<p>2:00 Brock Bernstein Thomas Jabusch</p>
8.	Decision: SC Transition to co-Chairs		<p>2:15 Brock Bernstein</p>

	Regulatory agencies and non-regulatory participants will each nominate a chair person, who will alternate terms starting with the chair representing non-regulatory participants <u>Desired outcome:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Approve nominated chairs- Decide on transition period and 1st meeting to be chaired by nominees- Decide on frequency of alternating terms (yearly or other)		
9.	Plus/Delta, set dates and agenda topics for upcoming meetings		3:15 Brock Bernstein
10.	Adjourn		3:30

Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

July 14, 2014

9:30 AM – 3:30 PM

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Building

Sunset Maple Room

10060 Goethe Road, Sacramento, CA 95827

Draft Summary

Attendees:

Voting Steering Committee (and/or Alternate) members present¹:

Kenneth Landau, Regulatory – State (Central Valley Water Board)

Tim Vendlinski, Regulatory – Federal (USEPA)

Gregg Erickson, Coordinated Monitoring (Interagency Ecological Program)

Dave Tamayo, Stormwater, Phase I Communities (Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership)

Stephanie Reyna-Hiestand, Stormwater, Phase II Communities (City of Tracy)

Linda Dorn, POTWs (SRCSD)

Josie Tellers, POTWs (City of Davis)

Margaret Orr, POTWs (City of Stockton)

Stephanie Fong, Water Supply (SFCWA)

Others present:

Brock Bernstein, Facilitator

Thomas Jabusch, SFEI-ASC

Jay Davis, SFEI-ASC

Philip Trowbridge, SFEI-ASC

Brian Laurenson, LWA/Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership

¹ Name, Representation (Affiliation)

Meghan Sullivan, Central Valley Water Board

Dalia Fadl, City of Sacramento

Vyomini Upadhyay, SRCSD

Karen Ashby, LWA

Joe Domagalski, USGS

1.	Introductions A quorum was established.
2.	Announcements from Committee Members Jay Davis provided an update to the Steering Committee about the 2015 State of the Estuary report that is currently underway. He suggested that the TAC should play at least an advisory or review role with the water quality portion of the document because it is an important information product and it is crucial to make sure it presents an accurate picture of the system. This type of product becomes even more powerful if there is consensus amongst those involved and coordinating to support the findings. Stephanie Fong relayed the connection between the State of the Estuary report and the Monitoring Council's Estuaries Workgroup Portal and reiterated that Meghan Sullivan regularly participates in the Estuaries Workgroup. Gregg Erickson announced that IEP is undertaking a Director's review to consider the various requirements for monitoring and it would be useful to get input from the Delta RMP TAC about what monitoring is useful and will aid the information needs. Ken Landau confirmed that he is retiring in November and that the Water Board plans to hire his replacement soon to allow for a few months of overlap before Ken's departure.
3.	Approve Agenda and Summary There were no comments on the agenda or the 19 May meeting summary.
4.	TAC Update: Status of Monitoring Design Joe Domagalski provided progress updates from the TAC and its four subcommittees and the near-term plans. Tables designed to capture the subcommittee's decisions and progress in relation to answering the management questions were distributed to Steering Committee members in hard copy. The subcommittees are working towards constituent-specific monitoring designs but

Delta RMP Steering Committee Meeting

September 29, 2014

9:30 AM – 3:30 PM

Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Building

Sunset Maple Room

10060 Goethe Road, Sacramento, CA 95827

Draft Summary

Attendees:

Voting Steering Committee (and/or Alternate) members present¹:

Kenneth Landau, Regulatory – State (Central Valley Water Board)

Tim Vendlinski, Regulatory – Federal (USEPA)

Gregg Erickson, Coordinated Monitoring (Interagency Ecological Program)

Stephanie Reyna-Hiestand, Stormwater, Phase II Communities (City of Tracy)

Linda Dorn, POTWs (SRCSD)

Josie Tellers, POTWs (City of Davis)

Dalia Fadl, Stormwater, Phase I Communities (City of Sacramento)

Val Connor, Water Supply (SFCWA)

Mike Wackman, Agriculture (San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition)

Erich Delmas, POTWs (City of Tracy)

Others present:

Brock Bernstein, Facilitator

Thomas Jabusch, SFEI-ASC

Jay Davis, SFEI-ASC

Philip Trowbridge, SFEI-ASC

¹ Name, Representation (Affiliation)

Brian Laurenson, LWA/Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership

Meghan Sullivan, State Water Board

Karen Ashby, LWA

Adam Laputz, Central Valley Water Board

Patrick Morris, Central Valley Water Board

Jeanne Chilcott, Central Valley Water Board

Stephen McCord, MEI

Debbie Webster, CVCWA

Shakoora Azimi-Gaylon, Delta Conservancy

Tom Grovhoug, LWA

1.	Introductions A quorum was established.
2.	Announcements from Committee Members Ken Landau introduced Adam Laputz, who will replace him as the Central Valley Water Board SC representative starting November 7. The proposed permit language amendment for NPDES dischargers in the Delta that would allow for participation in the Delta RMP in lieu of individual receiving water monitoring requirements is scheduled as the last item of the agenda for Friday afternoon at the 9/10 October Central Valley Regional Board meeting. The proposed permit language amendment signifies that modifications to individual permits are coming but there are no details yet. Linda Dorn explained that the resolution is different from an amendment to an individual permit. Debbie Webster added that the permit language as written in the resolution represents a proposal. The decision to bring the permit language to the Regional Board for adoption is to lay the legal framework within which the details of individual permit modifications can be figured out. Comments received by Regional Board staff indicate that some interest groups want to see a decision about RMP participation on a discharge-by-discharge basis. The position of Regional Board staff is to provide reassurances that even though receiving water monitoring is going away, there will still be monitoring. They are also referencing the Bay RMP, where NPDES dischargers don't have receiving water monitoring but have an RMP, and where the corresponding permit condition is only 2 lines and very generic.

3.	<p>Approve Agenda and Summary</p> <p>There were no comments on the agenda or the 14 July meeting summary.</p>
4.	<p>Discussion: Program Funding</p> <p>Based on statements made during this discussion, there would be a commitment to the program by potential participants and base funding for Year 1. In addition, the RMP has the opportunity to draw in additional resources and making sure that questions are addressed through other mechanisms. There is interest in coming up with a formula for program structuring and funding. However, as observed by Tim Vendlinski, it is unlikely that the SC would find the “Rosetta stone” to get everything right from the get-go.</p> <p>There was some discussion on what would constitute “base funding” for a “core program”. Linda Dorn suggested looking into the program structure of other programs as an orientation point. For example, the core program of the Bay RMP consists of monitoring along the spine of the bay. Ken Landau remarked that in the Bay RMP, there is an understanding that studies in some year may benefit, for example, refineries more, and in other years, other participants may see more benefit overall in proposed activities. Jay added that in these instances, participants with a strong interest in a study might add more money to it. Brock added that the Bight Program does the same. Gregg Erickson commented that the terminology would need to be clear. He suggested that special studies are more ephemeral in nature compared to the core program. For example, pathogens could be seen as a first special study that would sunset and not as a component of the core program, which would be things to look at year after year.</p> <p>Brock Bernstein summarized that there would be a lot of benefit in coordinating with external efforts but that clearly some conversations will need to finish, even without finding the “Rosetta stone”. Meanwhile, Regional Board staff will have conversations about the legal flexibility of NPDES permit conditions and the TAC will have conversations about internal and external coordination. Ken Landau and Tim Vendlinski are investigating opportunities for directing SWAMP and/or additional federal funds towards the RMP. The total SWAMP budget for R5 is \$750K, of which EPA funds half.</p> <p><u>Outcomes/recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Keep in mind the idea of hiring a neutral facilitator to evaluate the situation

	<p>and prepare a funding proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Further develop ideas for funding the program
5.	<p>Discussion: Criteria for adequate participation</p> <p>The draft criteria are generic principles and leave it up to each group to develop their own formula for the expected contributions for each of its members. Jay Davis explained that this is the model used in the Bay RMP, where each group has to figure out contributions of members to the group's share of the program budget. The dredgers are the biggest and most complicated group in the Bay RMP and have a complicated formula. In general, there are three things that keep participants in programs like this: 1) peer pressure, 2) benefits that a program provides, or 3) some sort of penalty. Jay noted that in more mature programs such as the Bay RMP, nobody thinks about dropping out due to the benefits of participation. He suggested that this is something that Delta RMP participants will realize further down the road.</p> <p>Brock Bernstein noted that some programs consider participation on the TAC as a funding contribution, whereas others don't. He added that there is a cost associated with accountability. Moreover, free in-kind time would allow adding additional services to the program.</p> <p>The role and significance of in-kind support from participants would still need to be determined. Some programs rely mostly on in-kind support (Bight Program), others mostly on cash contributions (Bay RMP).</p> <p><u>Outcomes/recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Draft criteria to be reworked based on upcoming discussions
6.	Lunch break
7.	<p>TAC update: status of monitoring design</p> <p>Stephen McCord (TAC co-chair) presented outlines of the monitoring designs for each of the four focus areas (TAC co-Chair Joe Domagalski was not able attend the meeting). Overall, the monitoring designs are coming along well, but there is still some work to do on internal and external coordination. The full monitoring plan will be completed by January 2015 and will include the final designs and overall program costs (including data management and program management).</p> <p>The current focus of the TAC is on completing the monitoring designs and their</p>

costs to inform funding decisions, as requested by the SC. The budgets associated with the proposed designs don't yet account for cost sharing with other programs.

Mercury

Methylmercury monitoring would focus on the development of a long-term data record to address Status and Trends questions about changes of concentrations in fish tissue and water. Water sampling would be more often (1x/month) than fish sampling (1x/year) but at less sites. There are 5 proposed sites for water and 10 proposed sites for fish monitoring. Pending a decision by the SC to move forward on mercury, the subcommittee would be working on minor adjustments. The required standard techniques for both fish and water sampling make it challenging to piggyback onto another program. Potential data products include graphs of a) ranges of methylmercury concentrations (mean and 95% confidence intervals) in sportfish in Delta waterbodies and tributaries, grouped by subareas, and b) long-term trends for the Delta as a whole for average methylmercury in muscle fillets of largemouth bass >350mm. Largemouth bass is a good indicator species for mercury in fish, even though it is an invasive species in the Delta. It has a small home range and sits at the right level in the food chain. It is being used statewide as an indicator of mercury in fish.

Next steps for the mercury subcommittee include the mapping of proposed RMP sites and other sites and coordination with partners, such as the USGS National Water Quality Assessment (NAWQA) program and DWR mercury modelers (DWR currently funds most of the mercury work in the state). Although USGS and DWR are IEP member agencies (and DWR participates in IEP's wetlands mercury group), the NAWQA and DWR's mercury modeling effort are outside of the IEP coordination. DFW is the biggest funder of MeHg research in the state.

Nutrients

The plans of the nutrients subcommittee are to a) firm up the budget estimate, b) leverage and augment existing funding to fill data gaps, c) synchronize the proposed analysis/synthesis with the Delta Nutrient Research Plan, and d) focus on the analysis/ synthesis prior to developing the monitoring design. Val Connor asked the nutrients subcommittee to obtain SFWCA's database of nutrients/foodweb project data, which includes data from studies conducted by USGS, IEP, RTC, UC Davis (e.g., Randy Dahlgren's group) and others.

Pathogens

Pathogens management questions to be addressed include: 1) Status and Trends: Are current pathogen levels supportive of the municipal drinking water quality beneficial use as described in the Basin Plan? And 2) Sources, Pathways, Loadings, and Processes: Can any changes in bin level be attributed to an identifiable event, condition, or changes in a source? The proposed RMP study would be an add-on to existing monitoring, by supporting additional analyses. The sample collection would be at no cost to the RMP. Data products would include a Basin Plan Trigger Assessment, performed as a tabular comparison of partial intake results to identify a potential trigger (80% of bin level).

The proposed study would be completed in two years. The study objectives for Year 1 are well defined and will determine the detection frequency for pathogens and indicator species. Year 2 would be a follow-up study using PCR to determine sources of pathogens at areas with high detection frequencies. Year 1 data are needed to plan the details for Year 2. As a next step, the subcommittee is planning to finalize the design and monitoring plan to have options to move forward on, even though there is uncertainty whether the RMP would fund a pathogens study. The subcommittee is also establishing a communication plan and a benefits analysis that would inform the costing of the study.

Current Use Pesticides

The current use pesticides subcommittee has not yet agreed on a final recommendation for the monitoring design. The pending main issue to be resolved is the recommended proportion of chemical analyses vs. toxicity testing, because the preferred option of doing “everything everywhere” is cost-prohibitive. Additional options for scaling back include reducing the number of sites or frequency. The subcommittee is planning to meet again on October 8. Josie Teller stated that it would be difficult and unusual to decide on funding without an agreement on a recommendation by the subcommittee. Val Connor indicated that she would be ok with phasing pesticides monitoring in over several years.

Outcomes/recommendations:

- Mercury subcommittee to coordinate with IEP’s tidal wetland monitoring project work team, which is developing a MeHg monitoring component.
- Pesticides subcommittee to agree on a recommendation to the TAC and SC

	<p>and finalize design, consolidate with other RMP elements, and coordinate with external partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Pesticides subcommittee to keep overarching question in mind when developing recommendation: “Is there a problem?” – Moving forward, better define TAC and subcommittee decision-making process – Stephen McCord to facilitate next pesticides subcommittee meeting
8.	<p>Decision: Committee roles and responsibilities</p> <p>There was some discussion about whether the Regional Board should be identified as the lead agency for the Delta RMP in the Roles and Responsibilities document. Ken Landau commented that, hopefully, data coming out of the RMP would not solely benefit the Regional Board and that not all RMP data would necessarily be feeding Regional Board basin plan decisions. In Region 2, the Basin Plan is an important driver for the RMP but it isn't the only one. Brock Bernstein explained that he is currently setting up a similar program in the San Diego region. Although the San Diego Regional Board initiated the program, Forest Service, USDA, and other agencies have become the main drivers of the San Diego RMP.</p> <p>The discussion also revealed the need to further clarify the role of the implementing entity. According to Brock, one main function of the implementing entity is setting up RMP contracts.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The section on the Implementing Entity should be edited to clarify who are the staff and the Leadership team for the Delta RMP. – Add paragraph about the genesis of the program and what it is about
9.	<p>SC transition to co-Chairs</p> <p>The committees are currently in the heavy lifting phase of the program development and the TAC will soon be completing its initial task of developing a monitoring plan. The SC will need to find a chair by the time Brock’s contract ends. Brock explained that the job of the chair would not be not to steer the program. Main responsibilities would include setting the SC meeting agenda, working with staff to make sure meeting materials are valuable, etc. Gregg Erickson explained that he is mainly doing scut work in his role as the IEP chair as someone who's</p>

	<p>responsible the crew follows up etc. He advised that it would be good to have one person act as the chair at the meeting, and have a second person (co-chair or vice chair) to step in, make sure notes reflect what is said, etc. Overall, participants felt confident in the overall process.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – It was decided to have two chairs, one chair from the regulatory agencies and one from the non-regulatory participants. – The chairs will act as chair and vice chair and will alternate terms (either yearly or at some other frequency) starting with the chair representing non-regulatory participants. – The two groups will each convene and nominate a person to be one of the chairs at the next meeting.
10.	<p>Next meeting The next meeting has been scheduled for November 7 (9:30 am -3:30 pm) at the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District). Meeting topics will include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Year 1 monitoring plan
11.	<p>Action items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Send out reminder note to the SC about the Board meeting (Thomas, by October 9) – Email ideas for program funding to Thomas Jabusch (Steering Committee representatives, by October 10) – Forward MeHg TMDL language for participation to Thomas (Patrick Morris, by October 18) – Provide final draft design summaries and budgets (TAC, by October 31). – Obtain SFCWA’s nutrients/foodweb projects database (Nutrients subcommittee, by October 31) – Further develop budgets for monitoring designs and estimate overall program management costs (SFEI-ASC, by October 31) – Edit Roles and Responsibilities document based on discussion (Thomas, by October 31) – Finish monitoring design “cover”, including a description of relative timelines (SFEI-ASC/TAC co-Chairs, by October 31, 2018)

are looking for linkages between sites. The consolidation of the design and the proposed core sites will be discussed at the next TAC meeting.

In general, the initial monitoring plan will focus on a core monitoring design for each priority constituent but also identify special studies needed to answer initial questions, with the proposed pathogen study being much more targeted than the other elements and somewhere in-between. Finalizing the monitoring plan will involve negotiating the needs of the Steering Committee, the needs identified by the technical subgroups, and the interests of additional partners. Overall, the monitoring interests and regulatory drivers for each of the subgroups are considerably different.

Mercury – For the mercury subgroup, the monitoring design will link with the TMDL process and needs as well as support the development of a mercury model based on DSM2. Work is in progress to refine proposed sites that relate to historic fish tissue monitoring sites and to connect fish monitoring with water monitoring.

Nutrients – There is no clear regulatory driver to inform the nutrient monitoring design development. However, nutrients are implied as a factor involved in various undesirable conditions (macrophytes, species shifts, low DO). The nutrient element would build heavily on on-going work by others (e.g. ongoing SFEI and USGS studies as well as Regional Board studies) in order to put information and future actions in context. As such, the subcommittee is proposing to spend resources on a synthesis and analysis, including a station analysis, rather than create a new monitoring design plan for nutrients. However, if there is a strong rationale for “piggy-backing” nutrients or nutrient-associated parameters to the proposed new monitoring or continuing efforts, such “no-regret actions” would be included as part of the ultimate design plan that is brought back to the Steering Committee. Some members of the SC suggested a full literature review may be helpful in addition to an analysis of existing information and the work currently underway.

Pesticides – the current use pesticides subcommittee is developing a toxicity-based monitoring element, corresponding to the need to understand how the combination of pesticide active ingredients (AIs) + AI degradates + formulation “inert” ingredient(s) + their degradation products + any other potential toxicants overlying in the water and sediment (e.g., heavy metals) contribute to toxicity. The initial design plan would vary based on the ultimate amount of funding available,

	<p>but the plan is to include sampling at least five times a year (at key events – dry, wet, etc.) at sites there are mostly consistent with those proposed by the discharger community for ambient monitoring stations. The proposal includes a mix of initial screening followed by some chemical analyses as well as sites with chemical analysis at the start. For water column testing, the design proposes the traditional three toxicity test species plus <i>Hyalella</i>. For sediment testing, the design proposes coordination with the SWAMP SPoT program, which uses <i>Hyalella</i> and <i>Chironomus</i>.</p> <p>The SC expressed concern about the expansion of the scope of the design from tracking the status and trends of current use pesticides to a broader tracking of the status and trends of toxicity as well as about the inclusion of TIEs in the program. The pesticide subcommittee has some additional meetings planned to refine the design.</p> <p>Pathogens – the main purpose of the proposed monitoring element for pathogens would be confirming that there would be no increase in <i>Cryptosporidium</i> and <i>Giardia lamblia</i> numbers in drinking water supplies due to changes in source water. The proposed RMP contribution would be to fund pathogen analyses for the proposed work plus coordination of any subsequent special studies, as Municipal Water Quality Investigations (MWQI) would be doing the majority of the sampling. The first year of the proposed study would primarily be a status and trends study, while the second year would look further into potential impacts and perform detailed sampling at locations where problems were identified. The pathogens subcommittee was looking to get feedback on the amount of detail in the design. The SC agreed that brevity is key but more detail is suggested in relation to budget needs and the specific questions to be answered.</p> <p>The current plan is that the TAC and SFEI-ASC would report back by October with an initial design of a consolidated initial “no regrets” monitoring plan that would be expected to hold up in a peer review.</p>
5.	<p>Decision: TAC Roles and Responsibilities</p> <p>A revised version of the roles and responsibilities document was present that included additional clarification on the roles of the TAC Co-Chairs and information on the roles and responsibilities of the implementing entity (which is ASC at this point). Staff clarified that the TAC Co-Chairs have considerably more work to do</p>

	<p>now than they will in the future just due to the developing nature of the monitoring design.</p> <p>Steering Committee members suggested further revisions to the document, including language articulating the need to facilitate decisions and not just document them and explicitly referring to the development of meeting agenda and materials. SC members also suggested a clearer link to the organization of the RMP and suggested a roster be included, which would provide consistent naming of groups involved. Discussion about the liaison between committees indicated a need to further clarify the roles and the overlap between the TAC Co-Chairs and the implementing entity and revisit the need for TAC Co-Chairs after the design period is completed.</p> <p>Staff also presented a scorecard used in the Bay RMP as a tool to track progress in terms of goals and deliverables. The Bay RMP SC has found the card to be an efficient way to stay on track and it is quickly reviewed at the end of each meeting. The color-coding provides focus for what needs more discussion. The SC supported the concept of improved tracking.</p> <p><u>Outcomes/recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Implement a dashboard type tracking tool to improve tracking of deliverables and timelines – Revise and refine the roles and responsibilities document further – Revisit the TAC Co-Chair role and who fills that role
6.	<p>Action: Funding for Stephen McCord</p> <p>Stephen's funding for serving as a TAC co-Chair has ended. Joe Domagalski (USGS) is salaried and currently not receiving additional funding to serve as a TAC co-Chair. Thus, a discussion was sought about the additional funding required for Stephen (~\$25K) to continue as a TAC co-Chair.</p> <p>The SC agreed that the hours and tasks presented in a scope of work were reasonable, but the costs clearly indicate the need to transfer the role once the design phase is completed. Regional San has agreed to pay half of the proposed costs for the scope of work and to reevaluate the situation in October, wherein if progress is satisfactory, Regional San would likely fund the remaining portion of the tasks in the scope of work.</p>

	<p>The SC asked to have a future agenda item about the TAC Co-Chairs and whether agency or in-kind staff should fill that role and/or ASC. The discussion needs to also better define who will be the liaison between the SC and the TAC. As part of this, meeting decisions need to be more clearly documented and confirmed both in the moment and in the meeting summaries.</p> <p><u>Outcomes/decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Staff will clarify and specify the job descriptions of the TAC co-chairs and staff – The terms of the initial TAC co-Chairs and TAC will end upon completion of the initial monitoring plan. – Decisions and directives will be more clearly identified – Add an agenda item about to the next meeting about who will fill the TAC Co-Chair role after the design phase
7.	Lunch
8.	<p>Discussion: ASC Contract</p> <p>Staff provided an overview of the workplan for the current ASC contract and a roadmap for RMP development. The workplan included some very preliminary cost estimates for various tasks to give SC members a better understanding of the larger picture and seek input for tasks that should be prioritized with the current funding.</p> <p>The contract requires completion of two key products, the monitoring design and the multi-year program plan. With these products and the current meeting frequency, there isn't much money for other tasks included in the workplan. Discussion centered on the range of budget costs for the program and some of the tasks, such as data management and peer review that would be slightly more phased. The variety of issues related to data management indicated a potential need for an additional TAC subcommittee to explore these issues in more detail and to have a discussion about data management and QA/QC protocols for the program.</p> <p>The overview showed the variety and extent of tasks needed and brought to attention the projected funding required to start up the program versus the funding presently committed and available, while highlighting some of the key deliverables and potential opportunities to leverage certain tasks for the program.</p> <p><u>Outcome/recommendation:</u></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Provided a clearer picture of the costs of the program and a mutual understanding of the scope and duration of the existing funding – Document the contributions that have already been made – Review the report from the data summit, when available, to get direction for the process of data management within the context of the Delta RMP
9.	<p>Discussion: Program Funding</p> <p>Staff provided an overview of the potential funding models for the program, detailed in a previously prepared strawman that was distributed prior to the meeting. As the program has developed, it has become clear that the simplest option to fully fund the program through efficiencies across existing monitoring programs is not feasible in the Delta, even though it could provide some program funding.</p> <p>Characterizing the costs of the minimum ambient monitoring required to fulfill current permit requirements is a complicated and ongoing task. The plan is to look at costs in aggregate and to identify benefits to participants. Staff noted that regardless of the monitoring, the program would have a certain amount of “overhead” related to administration, data management, analysis and reporting.</p> <p>As discussion turned to how different sectors would contribute (i.e. cash or in-kind contributions), the decision was made to set a budget number for planning purposes. Participants agreed \$1.5 Million was a good number for the first-year budget of the program. Participants agreed to have more discussion within each represented sector to see how close to the \$1.5 Million they can reasonably get with contributions. The next meeting will continue discussion about program funding and begin discussion how to allocate the costs of the program across the represented sectors.</p> <p><u>Outcome/recommendation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – For planning purposes, the group will plan on a \$1.5 Million budget for the first year of the program – Participants are tasked with speaking with various Boards and representatives to see how much money would be available as potential contributions to the program – Explore participation from other sectors not currently represented (dredgers, Caltrans)

10.	<p>Action: Criteria for Participation</p> <p>The concept of adequate participation only comes into play where permit requirements mandate program participation. The group discussed the Central Valley Salinity Coalition (CVSALTS) as a potential model but felt more specificity should be included than was in the CVSALTS document provided for review. Active program participation can potentially consist of funding, in-kind contributions, and constructively engaged Committee participants that are making the program run more efficiently by being prepared, bringing in ideas, etc.</p> <p>The Steering Committee questioned how participation would be measured in terms of accounting for in-kind contributions versus cash contributions.</p> <p>Jay Davis explained that in the Bay RMP, really it's about the fees that come in to the program. Not all groups participate in meetings regularly but they make their contributions. The theory is that there is incentive for participants to be actively involved in the program to ensure the program addresses their interest and thus increases the value of their contributions. A suggestion was made to look at the two-sentence definition of participation detailed in the Mercury Exposure Reduction Program. There was also a suggestion to set a minimum dollar amount and then acknowledge different types of contributions that would support that amount, within a guiding structure established by the SC.</p> <p>There was agreement in principle about how to monitor participation – by trying to monetize program activities based on tasks in a program workplan and that each sector (and participant in each sector) would be assessed a monetary contribution. In-kind contributions would be costed out to dollar amounts and credited to a sector by the amount of money saved to the RMP. Staff will draft the proposed criteria for participation to present to the SC.</p> <p><u>Outcome/recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Establish a monetary amount for each sector required as an active participant in the program. – Develop written criteria for adequate participation
11.	<p>Action: SC Transition to Co-Chairs</p> <p>Funding for Brock Bernstein's facilitation allows for up to three additional meetings. The major programmatic decisions (related to program design, funding, and participation) should be made or at least well structured within this time frame. As such, the SC will need to transition to elected Co-Chairs. The SC agreed to target an</p>

	<p>election of Co-Chairs two meetings from now and discuss the procedure for that election at the next meeting. Staff will prepare more detailed responsibilities for the SC Co-Chairs.</p> <p><u>Outcome/recommendations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Clarify the roles and tasks of the co-chairs – Establish a process for the election of co-chairs – Select Co-Chairs within the next two meetings
12.	<p>Plus/Delta</p> <p>Delta: Clearly and explicitly note the agreements along the way in real time. More introduction for the new people</p> <p>Plus: Everyone has been super positive Meeting materials in advance and nicely embedded in agenda</p>
13.	<p>Next meeting</p> <p>The next meeting has been tentatively scheduled for September 29 (9:30 am -3:30 pm at the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District). Meeting topics will include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) TAC update 2) Roles and Responsibilities 3) Criteria for active participation 4) Election and transition to SC co-chairs 5) Program Funding
14.	<p>Action items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1. Distribute the subgroup design tables electronically to SC members 7.2. Revise and refine the roles and responsibilities document based on SC comments 7.3. Develop tracking tool (based on Bay RMP scorecard) for use with the Delta RMP 7.4. Develop a clearer picture of the costs of various program administration tasks, including data management 7.5. Develop accounting of contributions to date 7.6. Distribute data summit reports, once available, to the SC for review and discuss need for a data management subcommittee 7.7. Draft 'Criteria for Participation' document 7.8. Develop responsibilities for the SC Co-Chairs and a procedure for election of